during the monsoon, the necessity for a Munsiff's Court at Pattanamtitta which was centrally situated as regards the nine pakuthies above mentioned, was felt keenly. He also pointed out that other localities like Chengannur, Tiruvalla, Changanacherry, Haripad, Mavelikara, Krishnapuram and Karunagapalli, where there were greater facilities of communication both by land and water had Munsiff's Courts at a distance of five miles. In case Government were of opinion that it was not desirable to establish a full-time Munsiff's Court at the place, the Member prayed that Government might at least be pleased to invest the local Tahsildar with the power of taking up civil cases also.

Dewan's reply.—The Member's request will be referred to the High Court for remarks.

39. The desirabilities of locating the Alleppey Additional Munsiff's Court at Ambalapuzha.

Mr. P. K. Narayana Aiyar (Member, Ambalapuzha Taluk) represented that there were now thirteen pakuthies over which the Alleppey (Principal and Additional) Munsiff's Courts exercised jurisdiction, that it would be more convenient, if the two courts were situated at convenient distances in two different places, that Alleppey as a commercial centre and a rising town of importance should have one court exercising jurisdiction over the pakuthies of Pulinkunnu, Alleppey, Kynakari, Ariad North, Ariad South, and Mararikulam, while the other court might conveniently be located at Ambalapuzha with jurisdiction over the other seven pakuthies of Talavadi, Kozhimukku, Takazhi, Porakad, Ambalapuzha, Nedumudi and Champakulam, and that the suggested distribution would give ample work to each court and make the court more easily accessible to the litigants, without in any way causing any substantial loss to Government. The Member also gave statistics to show that under the arrangement proposed by him the Ambalapuzha Court would have a file of roughly 800 civil suits and 450 small causes and the Alleppey Court 1,100 original suits and 1,300 small causes. According to the Member, the advantages of the suggested separation were among others, (1) a more efficient and speedy administration of justice resulting from each court confining its attention to a smaller area, (2) the convenience to the litigant public who would not have to go more than 9 or 10 miles at the most, while some had to go more than 15 miles under the existing arrangement and (3) a large number of the inhabitants of the taluk could have all their business with Government transacted at Ambalapuzha where the Taluk Cutcherry was now situated. The Member also brought to notice that throughout Central Travancore there was a separate Munsiff's Court within a distance of every eight or ten miles and that the people of Ambalapuzha had many a time prayed for the redress of that grievance.

Dewan's reply.—The matter was referred to the High Court and they say that the transfer is undesirable. In a matter like this Government are generally guided by the views of the High Court.

40. The desirability of transferring the appellate jurisdiction of the Vaikam Munsiff's Court from Parur to Kottayam or Alleppey.

Before *Mr. Ouseph Chacko*, Member, Vaikom Taluk, began his representation, the Dewan said.—Your request has been already granted.

Member.—The cases now pending before the Parur Court have not been transferred.

Dewan.—That is a minor matter. If you apply to the High Court, they will order a transfer of the cases.

Member.—The execution and trial cases are still before the Parur Court. If they are not sent from there, our troubles will not end for the next ten years.

Dewan's reply.—The representation will be referred to the High Court.

41. Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Todupuzha.

Mr. K. P. Aiyappan Pillai (Member, Todupuzha Taluk) represented that, in view of the large area of the Taluk, its slender means of communication and the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly